

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

JOSHUA K. BEASLEY, #02387790,

Plaintiff,

v.

HENDERSON COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:22-cv-234-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Joshua Beasley, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On October 20, 2022, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss this case without prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Docket No. 12. Specifically, the Report noted that Plaintiff did not name as defendants the deputies involved in the alleged incidents and explained that Plaintiff could cure this defect by filing a second amended complaint within thirty days. Plaintiff received a copy of the Report on December 2, 2022, but has not filed objections to the Report, nor has he amended his complaint. *See* Docket No. 13.


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 12) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **25th** day of **January, 2023**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE